<u>REMARKS</u>

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 28, 2010. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11 and 12 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 7, 9 and 10 to 12 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Office Action alleges that independent Claim 7 does not tie to another statutory category or transform the underlying subject matter, and that Claim 9 is directed to transitory subject matter such as a signal.

This rejection is traversed. In particular, Claim 7 recites writing and reading image information and authentication information to and from a storage device attached to a recording medium, and is therefore seen to tie to another statutory category. Nevertheless, without conceding the correctness of this rejection and solely in an effort to expedite prosecution, Claim 7 has been amended to recite using a processor to perform the steps of the method.

Meanwhile, it is not seen how the claimed storage medium of Claim 9 is interpreted as "transitory". First, consistent with the specification, the specification recites non-transitory media such as a hard disk. Furthermore, the specification is not seen to disclose that any storage media are transitory, much less that the storage media might be signals.

Moreover, Claim 9 is directed to a "computer-readable storage medium retrievably storing" and not to a "computer-readable medium". Thus, Claim 9 cannot

reasonably be interpreted to cover a transitory medium, since a transitory medium does not include the possibility of "retrievable storage", as specified in Claim 9.

Accordingly, even when given its broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification and the claim language, it is not understood how the claimed storage medium is interpreted as "transitory", or somehow susceptible to a rejection under § 101.

Nevertheless, without conceding the correctness of the rejection and solely in an effort to expedite prosecution, Claim 9 has been amended to recite a "non-transitory computer-readable storage medium", consistent with the January 26, 2010 memo from USPTO Director David Kappos.

Withdrawal of the § 101 rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,409,401. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 7, 9 and 10

Independent Claims 1, 7, 9 and 10 generally concern printing image information from a storage device attached to a recording medium.

According to aspects of Claims 1, 7, 9 and 10, an image is printed based on a first range of image information stored in the storage device if input user authentication information corresponds to first authentication information stored in the storage device, and an image is printed based on a second range of image information stored in the storage device if the input user authentication information corresponds to second authentication information stored in the storage device.

By virtue of this arrangement, it is ordinarily possible to tailor the range of content to be read from a storage device and printed in accordance with authentication of a specified user, even though the recording medium may be shared by several different users.

For example, in one non-limiting example embodiment described in the specification, data of a software specification may be stored in the storage device. A user enters an authentication key such as a password. Different users are granted access to a different range of data of the software specification based on the user's authentication key. Thus, for example, a general user may be allowed access only to a section regarding general functions of the software, whereas a specific user may be granted access to all of the source code. Naturally, it is understood that the claims are not limited by the disclosed embodiment, which is simply an example of an embodiment according to the claims.

Referring specifically to claim language, independent Claim 1 is directed to an image processing apparatus. An input unit inputs first image information to be printed on a recording medium and second image information to be stored in a storage device which is attached to the recording medium. A printer prints an image on the recording medium to which the storage device is attached. The image is based on the first image information. A writing unit writes the second image information, first authentication information for printing a first range of the second image information and second authentication information for printing a second range of the second image information to the storage device attached to the recording medium. In addition, a reading unit reads each of the second image information, the first authentication information and the second authentication information which have been stored in the storage device attached to the recording medium on which the image based on the first image information has been

printed. A user authentication information input unit inputs user authentication information. The printer prints an image based on the first range of the second image information read by the reading unit if the input user authentication information corresponds to the first authentication information, and prints an image based on the second range of the second image information read by the reading unit if the input user authentication information corresponds to the second authentication information.

Independent Claims 7 and 9 are directed to a method and a computer-readable storage medium, respectively, substantially in accordance with the apparatus of Claim 1.

Independent Claim 10 is directed to an image processing apparatus. A printer prints an image. A reading unit reads image information, first authentication information for printing a first range of the image information and second authentication information for printing a second range of the image information. The image information, the first authentication information and the second authentication information are stored in a storage device attached to a recording medium. A user authentication information input unit inputs user authentication information. In addition, a controller controls the printer to print an image based on the first range of the image information read by the reading unit if the input user authentication information corresponds to the first authentication information, and controls the printer to print an image based on the second range of the image information read by the reading unit if the input user authentication information corresponds to the second authentication information.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of Claims 1, 7, 9 and 10, and in particular is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of printing

an image based on a first range of image information stored in a storage device attached to a recording medium if input user authentication information corresponds to first authentication information stored in the storage device, and printing an image based on a second range of image information stored in the storage device if the input user authentication information corresponds to second authentication information stored in the storage device.

As understood by Applicants, Petteruti is directed to a portable printer capable of printing on media and encoding information onto RFID circuits coupled to the media. See Petteruti, Abstract. A printer controller receives commands and data from a host terminal, and determines whether the commands and data are valid. If the commands and data are not valid, the command is ignored. If the commands and data are valid, the printer controller reads an RFID tag address of an RFID circuit, encodes the RFID circuit with the received data, and reports success or error of the encoding to the host terminal. See Petteruti, Figure 3.

Page 7 of the Office Action asserts that Petteruti (Column 4, lines 33 to 67) discloses inputting user authentication information, and determining a range of printable information in accordance with the input user authentication information and authentication information read from a storage device.

However, Petteruti simply discloses determining whether received commands are valid, and ignoring commands that are determined to be invalid. See Petteruti, Column 4, lines 33 to 67. A simple determination of whether a command is valid or not is not seen to correspond to determining a range of printable information based on input user authentication information. For example, Petteruti is not seen to disclose or

- 14 -

suggest that valid or invalid commands are related to a particular user. Furthermore, Petteruti's commands relate to data to be encoded to the RFID circuit, rather than data to be printed. See Petteruti, Column 4, lines 33 to 35 and 62 to 66.

Additionally, page 3 of the Office Action appears to equate data stored in Petteruti's RFID tag (e.g., product price, type, or other identifier, product information, quantity, or location, and in a baggage ticket, flight information, owner, or baggage identifier) with a range of data to be printed. However, it is not seen how the mere existence of different types of data on the RFID tag possibly corresponds to printing different ranges of data, much less printing a first or second range of data based on correspondence between stored authentication information and input user authentication information.

Accordingly, Petteruti is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of printing an image based on a first range of image information stored in a storage device attached to a recording medium if input user authentication information corresponds to first authentication information stored in the storage device, and printing an image based on a second range of image information stored in the storage device if the input user authentication information corresponds to second authentication information stored in the storage device.

Therefore, independent Claims 1, 7, 9 and 10 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested

Claims 11 and 12

Independent Claim 11 is directed to an image processing apparatus. An input unit inputs first image information to be printed on a recording medium and second

- 15 -

image information to be stored in a storage device which is attached to the recording medium. A printer prints an image on the recording medium to which the storage device is attached. The image is based on the first image information. A writing unit writes the second image information and first authentication information for printing a first range of the second image information to the storage device, and a reading unit reads each of the second image information and the first authentication information which have been stored in the storage device attached to the recording medium on which the image based on the first image information has been printed. A user authentication information input unit inputs user authentication information. The printer prints an image based on the first range of the second image information if the user authentication information is input and the input user authentication information corresponds to the first authentication information read by the reading unit, and prints an image based on a second range of the second image information if the user authentication information is not input.

Independent Claim 12 is also directed to an image processing apparatus. A reading unit reads image information and first authentication information for printing a first range of the image information. The image information and the first authentication information are stored in a storage device attached to a recording medium. A user authentication information input unit inputs user authentication information. A controller controls the printer to print an image based on the first range of the image information if the user authentication information is input and the input user authentication information corresponds to the first authentication information read by the reading unit, and controls the printer to print an image based on a second range of the image information if the user authentication information is not input.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of Claims 11 and 12, and in particular is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of printing an image based on a first range of the image information read from a storage device attached to a recording medium if user authentication information is input and the input authentication information corresponds to first authentication information read from the storage device, and printing an image based on a second range of the image information read by the reading unit if the user authentication information is not input.

In particular, as discussed above, Petteruti is not seen to disclose or suggest printing an image based on a first range of image information stored in a storage device attached to a recording medium if the input authentication information corresponds to first authentication information stored in the storage device, and printing an image based on a second range of image information stored in the storage device if the input authentication information corresponds to second authentication information stored in the storage device.

Accordingly, Petteruti is also not seen to disclose or suggest printing an image based on a first range of the image information read from a storage device attached to a recording medium if user authentication information is input and the input authentication information corresponds to the authentication information read from the storage device, and printing an image based on a second range of the image information read by the reading unit if the user authentication information is not input.

Therefore, independent Claims 11 and 12 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same

reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the claims, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Guzniczak/
Michael J. Guzniczak
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 59,820

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200